Pullen et al. Serial No. 10/604,638 Amendment of June 4, 2007 Page 2

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-20 stand rejected. Claims 6 and 9 are objected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1, 3-4 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as anticipated by Jacobson et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0113770. This rejection is traversed. More specifically, this rejection is traversed on the grounds that Jacobson does not describe an electrophoretic medium comprising an electrophoretically mobile *specularly reflective* particle.

Claim 1 of this application is directed to an electrophoretic medium comprising a plurality of at least one type of particle suspended in a suspending fluid and capable of moving therethrough on application of an electric field to the medium, the particles including at least one electrophoretically mobile *specularly reflective* particle (emphasis added). As discussed in Paragraph 10 of this application, prior art displays typically use particles which reflect in a Lambertian manner (i.e., the light incident upon the particles is reflected substantially equally in all directions), as illustrated for example in Figure 5. In contrast, the electrophoretic medium of the present invention uses at least one type of particle which is specularly reflective (i.e., shows mirror-like reflectivity); see Paragraph 14. As illustrated in Figure 7, and as discussed in Paragraph 51 of this application, the use of such specularly reflective particles improves the brightness of the display but permits the display to retain a substantially paper-like appearance.

Jacobson does not describe any display using specularly reflective particles. The applicants agree with the statements on page 2 of the Office Action that Jacobson discloses a plurality of at least one type of particle (Fig. 1A, 50) suspended in a suspending fluid (Figure 1A, 25) and capable of moving therethrough on application of an electric field to the medium. However, there is nothing in Jacobson to indicate that the electrophoretic particles are specularly reflective, and a great deal to indicate that the particles are conventional Lambertian reflective electrophoretic particles.

Pullen et al. Serial No. 10/604,638 Amendment of June 4, 2007 Page 3

Paragraph 51 of Jacobson, to which the Office Action refers, simply refers to "reflective" displays of various types and makes no mention of specular reflection. Paragraph 9 of Jacobson recites that the particles may include neat pigments, dyed (laked) pigments and pigment/polymer composites. None of these types of pigment particles would be expected to provide anything other than Lambertian reflection. There is no mention in Jacobson of any of the types of preferred specularly reflective particles recited in the present claim 10.

For the foregoing reasons, Jacobson does not anticipate any of the present claims.

The 35 USC 103(a) rejections of claims 10-15 as unpatentable over Jacobson, of claim 2 as unpatentable over Jacobson in view of Albert et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0089735, of claim 8 as unpatentable over Jacobson in view of Webber, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0180687, and of claims 5, 7 and 16-17 as unpatentable over Jacobson in view of Drzaic et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0180688, are all traversed for the same reasons as the 35 USC 102(a) rejection discussed above. None of the secondary references describe an electrophoretic medium containing specularly reflective particles, and hence none of them can make up for the deficiency in Jacobson noted above.

For the foregoing reasons, the 35 USC 102 and 103 rejections in the Office Action are unjustified and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of all claims of this application is respectfully requested.

Pullen et al. Serial No. 10/604,638 Amendment of June 4, 2007 Page 4

Since the prescribed period for responding to the Office Action expired March 13, a Petition for a three month extension of this period is filed herewith.

Respectfully submitted
/David J. Cole/
David J. Cole
Registration No. 29629

E INK Corporation 733 Concord Avenue Cambridge MA 02138

Telephone (617) 499-6069 Fax (617) 499-6200 E-mail dcole@eink.com